

## **REMARKS**

This document relates to issues raised in the examiner's office action mailed 2/13/2008. In that office action, claims 1-26 were rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103. A primary reference used by the examiner in rejecting the claims is Rowe (US 2003/0028779).

On pages 2-3 of the office action, the examiner objects to claims 27, 48, 69, and 72, and rejects claims 27-40, 48-61, and 69-70 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The presently pending claims have been amended for clarification purposes in order to more accurately define the scope of the present claimed invention.

During a telephonic interview between the undersigned attorney and the examiner on 5/8/08, the various rejections of the claims were discussed with respect to the examiner's rejections as stated in the office action mailed 2/13/2008. At the conclusion of the telephonic interview, it was agreed that the combination of features recited, for example, in each of the amended claims 27 and 41, overcomes all of the current rejections raised by the examiner in the 2/13/2008 office action.

Independent claims 48, 62, 69, and 71 define at least a portion of features similar to those defined in claims 27 and/or 41, and are therefore also believed to be allowable for at least those reasons stated above in support of claims 27 and 41. Additionally, each of the presently pending dependent claims is also believed to be allowable since it depends upon a respective independent claim.

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record.

Because the presently pending claims are believed to be allowable in their present form, many of the examiner's rejections in the Office Action have not been addressed in this response. However, applicant respectfully reserves the right to respond to one or more of the examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

### **No Disclaimers or Disavowals**

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather,

any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
WEAVER AUSTIN VILLENEUVE & SAMPSON LLP

/Dean E. Wolf/

Dean E. Wolf  
Reg. No. 37,260

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100